SUPPORT FOR THE AMENDMENTS

Claims 1-7 were previously canceled.

Claims 8 has been amended.

Claim 15 has been added.

The amendment of Claim 8 is supported by the specification as filed, for example, at page 19, lines 3-8. New Claim 15 is supported by the specification as filed, for example, at page 19, lines 16-31.

No new matter has been added by the present amendments.

REMARKS

Claims 8-15 are pending in the present application.

At the outset, Applicants wish to thank Examiner Eom and Examiner Soohoo for the helpful and courteous discussion with their undersigned Representative on September 1, 2009. During this discussion, Applicants presented various arguments and possible amendments to address the outstanding rejections. Applicants affirm the accuracy of the content of the Interview Summary mailed September 9, 2009. Applicants request reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

The rejection of Claims 8 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over Brennan et al is obviated by amendment.

Applicants make no statement with respect to the propriety of this ground of rejection and in no way acquiesce to the same. Solely to expedite examination of the present applciation, Claim 8 has been amended to add the limitation "the channel being planar and with a rectilinear axis relatively to the fluitlic network".

This configuration avoids dead volumes which might be caused by the partial or total path of the thickness of one or more of the substrates, after having covered a portion parallel to the planes of these substrates. Any turn is thereby avoided, which as emphasized earlier, is primordial, notably for conveying samples separated beforehand (see page 19, lines 8-15). At no point do Brennan et al disclose or suggest such a configuration.

Brennan et al disclose a microanalytical device wherein process zones (17a, 17b, ...) are connected to outlet ports (29a, 29b, ...) thanks to downstream microchannels (not referenced on Fig. 1). These microchannels do not have a rectilinear axis relative to the fluidic network. The

other figures also show such microchannels; see Figs. 2 and 3 with microchannels 41a, 41b, ..., Fig. 4 with microchannels 109x, 109b... These figures show that the process zones are always shifted with respect to the axes of the electronebulization nozzles.

Accordingly, Brennan et al cannot anticipate the claimed invention. Withdrawal of this ground of rejection is requested.

The rejections of: (a) Claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brennan et al in view of Jedrzejewski et al and (b) Claims 11-14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Brennan et al in view of Jedrzejewski et al and Yobas et al, are obviated by amendment.

Applicants make no statement with respect to the propriety of this ground of rejection and in no way acquiesce to the same. Solely to expedite examination of the present applciation, Claim 8 has been amended to add the limitation "the channel being planar and with a rectilinear axis relatively to the fluitlic network".

This configuration avoids dead volumes which might be caused by the partial or total path of the thickness of one or more of the substrates, after having covered a portion parallel to the planes of these substrates. Any turn is thereby avoided, which as emphasized earlier, is primordial, notably for conveying samples separated beforehand (see page 19, lines 8-15). At no point do Brennan et al, Jedrzejewski et al, or Yobas et al disclose or suggest such a configuration.

Brennan et al disclose a microanalytical device wherein process zones (17a, 17b, ...) are connected to outlet ports (29a, 29b, ...) thanks to downstream microchannels (not referenced on Fig. 1). These microchannels do not have a rectilinear axis relative to the fluidic network. The other figures also show such microchannels; see Figs. 2 and 3 with microchannels 41a, 41b, ..., Fig. 4 with microchannels 109x, 109b... These figures show that the process zones are always

shifted with respect to the axes of the electronebulization nozzles.

Jedrzejewski discloses a microfluidic device wherein channels 226 are perpendicular with respect to the nozzles 227 (see Fig. 25 for example). Jedrzejewski et al further disclose a microfluidic device comprising microfluidic channels (discharge portions 226(c)) forming the end of the transfer-separation channels 226. Each discharge portion 226(c) terminates in a nozzle 227 (see Fig. 27 and paragraph [0151]). Fig. 27 shows that the discharge portions 226(c) are perpendicular to the main portion of the transfer-separation channel 226. Jedrzejewski et al do not disclose having a rectilinear axis relative to the fluidic network.

Yobas et al fails to compensate for the aforementioned deficincies in the disclosures of Brennan et al and Jedrzejewski et al.

Thus, Applicants submit that the claimed invention is not obvious in view of Brennan et al and Jedrzejewski et al, even when combined with Yobas et al. Withdrawal of these grounds of rejection is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, L.L.P.
Norman F. Oblon

Vincent K. Shier, Ph.D.
Registration No. 50,552

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413-2220
(OSMMN 08/03)